

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division



JODI C. MAHDAVI,
Plaintiff,

v.

NEXTGEAR CAPITAL, INC., *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:14-cv-648

ORDER


The matter came before the Court on plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (doc. 4). The Supreme Court has made clear that a "plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). A preliminary injunction is inappropriate in this case because (i) plaintiff cannot demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits, and (ii) there is an adequate remedy at law because the automobile in question is not unique or irreplaceable.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, and for good cause,

It is hereby **ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (doc. 4) is **DENIED**.

The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to all counsel of record.

Alexandria, VA
June 20, 2014



T. S. Ellis, III
United States District Judge